



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/399,578	09/20/1999	DANIEL L. MARKS	AIS-P99-1	2427
7590 PETER K TRZYNA P.O.BOX 7131 CHICAGO, IL 606807131			EXAMINER WINDER, PATRICE L	
			ART UNIT 2452	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/21/2011	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/399,578

Applicant(s)

MARKS, DANIEL L.

Examiner

Patrice L. Winder

Art Unit

2452

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 December 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-291,309-366,376-502,504-519,521-536,538-553,555-570,572-590 and 592-995 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-943)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims pending in the application are 1-291,309-366,376-502,504-519,521-536,538-553,555-570,572-590 and 592-995.

DETAILED ACTION

Allowable Subject Matter

The indicated allowability of claims 1-164,166-291,309-365,376-408, 410-502, 504-519,521-536,538- 553,555-570,572-590,592-598,600-631,726-754,845-861,877,884,885,891,892,955-962,973-976 and 978-988 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Shastra. Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-291, 309-366, 376-502, 504-519, 521-536, 538-553, 555-570, 572-590, 592-995 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vinod Anupam et al., SHASTRA – An Architecture for Development of Collaborative Applications (hereafter Shastra) in view of Ahuja et al., USPN 5,689,553 (hereafter referred to as Ahuja). (See also Vinod Anupam et al., Shastra: Multimedia collaborative design environment and Vinod Anupam et al., Collaborative Multimedia Scientific Design in SHASTRA)

Regarding claim 1, Shastra taught a method of communicating via an Internet network (page 159, lines 45-47), the method including:

connecting a plurality of computers to a computer system, each of the plurality of computers connected to a respective input device and to a respective output device (page 155, lines 41-42, 54-63), said connecting responsive to receiving, from each of the computers, a password and a login name corresponding to a user identity, each said user identity corresponding to a respective particular user's stored access rights;

determining whether a first of the user identities and a second of the user identities are able to form a group for sending and for receiving communications in real time (page 157, lines 44-52; page 158, lines 13-18);

determining whether at least one of the first user identity and the second user identity, individually, is censored by the corresponding user's stored access rights (page 160, column 2, lines 65-68; page 161, column 1, lines 7-18, 63-68, column 2, lines 7-17, 43-61; page 162, column 1, lines 7-11, 24-37) from data in the communications representing at least one of a pointer, video, audio, a graphic, or multimedia (page 159, lines 58-68); and

if the first and the second user identities are able to form the group, forming the group for sending the communications (page 158, lines 13-18), also as to facilitate receiving the communications that are not censored wherein the receiving is in real time and via the Internet network, and to facilitate not presenting the data that is censored to the corresponding output device (page 160, column 2, lines 65-68; page 161, column 1, lines 7-18, 63-68, column 2, lines 7-17, 43-61; page 162, column 1, lines 7-11, 24-37).

Shastra does not specifically teach a password and a login name corresponding to a user identity. However, Ahuja taught a password and a login name corresponding to a user identity (column 12, lines 12-38). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that incorporating Ahuja's security in Shastra's collaboration system. The motivation would have been to regulate access to the collaboration system.

Regarding dependent claims 3-7, Shastra taught the method of claim 1, wherein the determining whether at least one of the first user identity and the second user identity, individually, is censored from data includes determining whether at least one of the first user identity and the second user identity, individually, is censored from data representing video, audio, graphic, multimedia (page 160, column 2, lines 65-68; page 161, column 1, lines 7-18, 63-68, column 2, lines 7-17, 43-61; page 162, column 1, lines 7-11, 24-37).

Regarding dependent claims 18-34, Shastra taught wherein at least some of the communications include at least one text or ascii (page 160, column 1, lines 67-68, column 2, lines 7-20).

Regarding dependent claims 35-51, Shastra taught further including:
determining whether at least one of the first and the second user identities, individually, is censored from sending in the communications data representing at least one of a pointer, video, a graphic, or multimedia (accepting data from Fronts with modify permission); and

sending the data that is not censored from sending (sending the data to Fronts with access permission).

Regarding dependent claims 52-68, Shastra taught further including determining whether at least one of the communications is censored (page 158, column 2, lines 28-48; page 159, column 2, lines 62-65). However, Shastra does not specifically teach managing the multimedia communications based on content. Downs taught managing the multimedia communications based on content (conference object including pointers, column 8, lines 9-18).

Regarding dependent claims 69-74, further including determining a user age corresponding to each of the user identities (Filepp taught age).

Regarding dependent claims 75-85, Shastra taught wherein the determining whether at least one of the first user identity and the second user identity, individually, is censored from data including determining whether a parameter corresponding to the first identity has been determined by an other of the user identity (moderator sets the access permission for other identities, i.e. fronts).

Regarding dependent claims 86-102, Shastra taught wherein the determining whether the first if the user identities and the second of the user identities are able to form a group includes determining whether the first of the user identities is censored (page 158, lines 51-67).

Regarding dependent claims 103-119, further including determining a user age corresponding to each of the user identities (Filepp taught age).

Regarding claim 170, Shastra taught a method of communicating via an Internet network (page 159, lines 45-47), the method including:

connecting a plurality of computers to a computer system (page 155, lines 41-42, 54-63);

receiving, from each of the plurality of computers, a respective login name and password corresponding to a respective user identity;

determining whether a first of the user identities and a second of the user identities are able to form a group for sending and for receiving communications in real time (page 157, lines 44-52; page 158, lines 13-18);

determining whether at least one of the first user identity and the second user identity, individually, is censored from sending data in the communications (page 160, column 2, lines 65-68; page 161, column 1, lines 7-18, 63-68, column 2, lines 7-17, 43-61; page 162, column 1, lines 7-11, 24-37), the data representing at least one of a pointer, video, audio, a graphic, or multimedia (page 159, lines 58-68); and

if the first and the second user identities are able to form the group, then forming the group, facilitating sending the communications that are not censored based on the individual user identity (page 158, lines 13-18), and facilitating receiving the communications that sent, wherein the receiving is in real time and via the Internet network (page 160, column 2, lines 65-68; page 161, column 1, lines 7-18, 63-68, column 2, lines 7-17, 43-61; page 162, column 1, lines 7-11, 24-37).

Claims 2, 8-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shastra and Ahuja and Atul Prakash et al., Distview for Building Efficient Collaborative Applications using Replicated Objects (hereafter referred to as Distview).

Regarding dependent claim 2, Shastra taught the method of claim 1, wherein the determining whether at least one of the first user identity and the second user identity, individually, is censored from data includes determining whether at least one of the first user identity and the second user identity, individually, is censored from data (page 158, column 2, lines 28-48; page 159, column 2, lines 62-65). However, Shastra does not specifically teach the data is a pointer. However, Distview taught data representing a pointer (pages 3-4, "Examples of Distview Based Application", Figures 2-4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that incorporating a pointer-triggered message in Shasta's collaboration system would have expanded the services. The motivation would have been to have another tool to share data between collaborators.

Regarding dependent claims 8-9, Shastra taught the method of claim 1, wherein the determining whether at least one of the first user identity and the second user identity, individually, is censored from data includes determining whether at least one of the first user identity and the second user identity, individually, is censored from data representing a pointer and a graphic, a pointer and audio (page 160, column 2, lines 65-68; page 161, column 1, lines 7-18, 63-68, column 2, lines 7-17, 43-61; page 162, column 1, lines 7-11, 24-37). However, Shastra does not specifically teach the data is a

pointer. However, Distview taught data representing a pointer (pages 3-4, "Examples of Distview Based Application", Figures 2-4). For motivation see claim 2, above.

Regarding dependent claims 10-12, Shastra taught wherein the determining whether at least one of the first user identity and the second user identity, individually, is censored from data includes determining whether at least one of the first user identity and the second user identity, individually, is censored from data representing a video and audio, video and a graphic, audio and a graphic (page 160, column 2, lines 65-68; page 161, column 1, lines 7-18, 63-68, column 2, lines 7-17, 43-61; page 162, column 1, lines 7-11, 24-37). For motivation see claim 2, above.

Regarding dependent claims 13-17, Shastra taught wherein the determining whether at least one of the first user identity and the second user identity, individually, is censored from data includes determining whether at least one of the first user identity and the second user identity, individually, is censored from data representing a pointer and video and audio, a pointer and video and a graphic, a pointer and audio and a graphic, video and audio and a graphic, a pointer and video and audio and a graphic (page 160, column 2, lines 65-68; page 161, column 1, lines 7-18, 63-68, column 2, lines 7-17, 43-61; page 162, column 1, lines 7-11, 24-37). However, Shastra does not specifically teach the data is a pointer. However, Distview taught data representing a pointer (pages 3-4, "Examples of Distview Based Application", Figures 2-4). For motivation see claim 2, above.

Regarding dependent claims 120-137, Distview taught wherein the pointer is a pointer that produces a pointer triggered message on demand (pages 3-4, "Examples of Distview Based Application", Figures 2-4).

Regarding dependent claims 138-148, Distview taught wherein the data that is censored from sending represents a pointer that produces a pointer triggered message on demand (pages 3-4, "Examples of Distview Based Application", Figures 2-4).

Regarding dependent claims 149-155, Distview taught wherein the pointer is a pointer that produces a pointer triggered message on demand (pages 3-4, "Examples of Distview Based Application", Figures 2-4).

Regarding dependent claims 156-160, Distview taught wherein the data that is censored from sending represents a pointer that produces a pointer triggered message on demand (pages 3-4, "Examples of Distview Based Application", Figures 2-4).

Regarding dependent claims 161-164, 165-169, Distview taught wherein the pointer is a pointer that produces a pointer triggered message on demand (pages 3-4, "Examples of Distview Based Application", Figures 2-4).

The above citations associated with the prior art references would equally apply to the remaining claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrice L. Winder whose telephone number is (571)272-3935. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 12:00 pm - 8:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thu V. Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-6967. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Patrice L Winder/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2452

January 18, 2011